(UNREDACTED)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

			WESTERN	DIVISION	
UNITED	STATES		AMERICA,)))	
VS.) NO. 13-20067	
ROBERT	DREW,)	
		D 6	efendant.	, , 	

LYNN DUDLEY
OFFICIAL REPORTER
923-A FEDERAL BUILDING
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103

APPEARANCES

Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff:

EDWARD L. STANTON, ESQ.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

SUITE 800

167 NORTH MAIN STREET

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103

BY: C. DAVID BIGGERS, JR., ESQ.

SAMUEL R. STINGFELLOW, ESQ.

ASSISTANT U. S. ATTORNEYS

Appearing on behalf of the Defendant:

DORIS RANDLE-HOLT
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
200 JEFFERSON AVENUE
SUITE 200
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103
BY: MARY C. JERMANN-ROBINSON
NEEDUM LOUIS GERMANY, III
ASSISTANT FEDERAL DEFENDERS

WITNESS PAGE LINE

NO WITNESSES

EXHIBIT INDEX

EXHIBIT NUMBER

PAGE LINE

NO EXHIBITS

1 THURSDAY MORNING 2 JULY 24, 2014 3 The sentencing hearing in this case began on this date, Thursday, July 24, 2014, at ten 4 5 o'clock a.m., when and where evidence was introduced and proceedings were had as follows: 6 7 8 9 10 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. 11 Bring in Mr. Drew, please. 12 (The defendant is present in the courtroom 13 at 10:14 a.m.) 14 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, 15 everyone. 16 MR. ROBERT DREW: Good morning. 17 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Good morning, Your 18 Honor. 19 MR. BIGGERS: Good morning. 20 THE COURT: For the record, this is the 2.1 United States versus Robert Drew set today for 22 sentencing. 23 Memory serves me correctly the matter went 24 to trial and the jury returned verdicts of guilty on

all of the counts against Mr. Drew.

25

We are here today to fix the sentence 1 2 under the statutes and quidelines and things of that 3 nature. I need to first ask if both sides are 4 5 ready to proceed. 6 Mr. Biggers. 7 MR. BIGGERS: Your Honor, the government 8 is prepared to proceed on today. And I want to make 9 sure that the court has a copy of the position 10 paper. 11 THE COURT: I've read it. 12 MR. BIGGERS: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Robinson. 14 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: We're ready, Your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: Just for the forward, as I 17 normally do I like to go through the guidelines as 18 well as the applicable statutes involved in this 19 case, that will be our starting point. 20 There are some objections to some of the 21 provisions in the Presentence Report. As I 22 indicated, the Presentence Report has been prepared, 23 both sides have filed position papers. I reviewed 24 all the material, also gone over the facts of the

case, the notes that I took during the trial, things

25

of that nature.

2.1

Of course, after we get the guidelines and the proper statutes in place and all, then we will proceed with the second phase of sentencing.

Although I will note for the record that the statutes really control, in -- in large part, the sentences that I can fix, although there is some flexibility with some of the offenses, you know, the firearms charges, of course, are controlled by statute. And, of course, I will hear from both sides in that regard as we go through.

But let me start with going through the Presentence Report calculations, get our starting point in place, then I will hear from both sides. I will hear first from the defense, of course, because of the objections that have been filed. The government has no objections, it's my understanding, but has responded to the objections filed by the defense.

The calculations really begin paragraph 14 of the Presentence Report on page 16. There's certain groups of calculations that are involved in this case. There were two actual -- well, attempt robberies that the defendant was found guilty of on the same date, two locations roughly 15 to 20 miles

2.1

apart, if I'm not -- if memory serves me, one of the attempts occurred in Memphis, the second one occurred in or near Oakland, Tennessee right along on Highway 64.

Count -- group one, felon in possession of a firearm, attempt armed robbery of the Hickory

Center Market, you see that on -- on -- in paragraph

14, counts one and three are grouped for guideline calculation purposes as set out in paragraph 15.

Base level offense for this offense and the section of the guidelines also provides that the defendant committed any part of the offense subsequent to having at least two prior felony convictions, crimes of violence or controlled substances, then the base offense level is 24.

Of course, I believe there's an objection to this section, we will talk about that shortly.

So we start off with a 24 for this group.

There are no adjustments either way. And so the adjusted offense level is 24.

Count group two, we see paragraph 22, carrying, using, brandishing a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, the jury did return a verdict of guilty on that count. And the indication was that they found beyond a reasonable

doubt that the defendant brandished a weapon during that offense. And so the sentence is not less than seven years confinement and up to — to life and has to be served consecutive to group three, robbery affecting commerce, attempt robbery of the Kentucky Fried Chicken, we see at paragraph 23 the base offense level for this one is a 20. There are no adjustments either way in that regard. And so the adjusted offense level is a 20.

And group four, again, using, carrying, brandishing a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, a robbery in this case, it's an attempt robbery. Of course, the statute provides that the sentencing range is not less than 25 years up to life imprisonment.

Then we have the multiple count adjustments. Okay. We see there the adjusted offense levels for really group one and group three for the robberies, one unit for each. That gives us a total number of units at two. The greater of the adjusted offense levels is a 24. So you add in the two you see at paragraph 35 and then -- I'm sorry -- 32, gives us a combined adjusted offense level of 26.

All that is for naught because in

paragraph 34 we see that because of the defendant's criminal history, he is a career offender. And that offense level is a 32. Of course, there's an objection there.

Paragraph 35 shows that he is also an armed career criminal, which is an offense level of a 34. And I think the higher guideline range is the one that, under the guidelines, we are to use. And so the total offense level is a 34.

There's no points for acceptance of responsibility.

And as mentioned, the defendant has quite a few entries on his criminal history. And the sum and substance of it we see at paragraph 51 on page 15, criminal convictions that are set out on the previous pages gives us a criminal history score of 23.

The defendant committed the offense, the offenses involved in this case while on parole. We see at paragraph 52 all of the offenses that he was on parole for. Therefore, two points are added to his criminal history score.

So we have a total criminal history score of 25. And that gives rise to a Criminal History Category of VI.

And it is an armed career criminal, which gives us a Criminal History Category of VI anyway.

And then for the sentences that we're looking at, we see paragraph 82 on page 21, counts one and four the maximum term of imprisonment is 20 years on each of those.

Count Two, that was one of the 924(c)'s, the minimum term of imprisonment is seven years up to life, as I indicated before.

Count Three, the minimum term of imprisonment because of his criminal history, that's a 922, possession of the firearm, the minimum term of imprisonment is 15 years and it's up to life.

Count Five, that's the second 924(c) conviction, 25 years is the minimum and up to life.

Paragraph 85, based on the total offense level of 34, Criminal History Category of VI, that gives us an imprisonment range for counts one, three and four of 262 months to 327 months.

And then, of course, we have the mandatory minimum for counts two, three and five that are also in place, and they are set out in paragraph 86.

There's also a question about an undischarged term of imprisonment. We'll address that in the regular course, and that is identified

1 and set out in paragraph 88. 2 That's kind of a summary of the decisions 3 and issues that have to be dealt with today. 4 Am I accurate in that, probation? 5 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Did I get it right. All 7 right. 8 THE PROBATION OFFICER: You did. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Biggers, anything? 10 MR. BIGGERS: Nothing from the government, 11 Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: And, Ms. Robinson? 13 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Insofar the 14 calculations? 15 THE COURT: Yes. MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No -- no problems 16 17 with that. 18 THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and 19 deal with the objections at this time. 20 And let me hear first from Ms. Robinson. 21 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Basically they are 22 for all purposes of preserving the record, Your 23 Honor. 24 THE COURT: I understand. 25 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Our -- our

objections A and B, I guess, on paragraphs -- the convictions shown in paragraphs 43, 48, and I think those are all simple robberies, meaning they're robberies, I guess, without a firearm.

We have to concede that there is clear case law that, in fact, they are crimes of violence, but that case is up on cert. --

THE COURT: Yeah.

2.1

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: -- just for the record, I would like to preserve that the convictions in paragraphs 43 and 48, our assertion is that they are not crimes of violence or violent felonies, whether it's guideline or by the statute --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: -- but armed career
criminal.

Also, for the record, Your Honor, we object to the -- to the 922(g) case, the felon in possession of firearm, that that matter was not -- his prior convictions weren't charged in the indictment, they weren't proven to the jury.

I know that Almendarez-Torres is the law of the land at this point. However, there's several things that keep percolating -- percolating around

2.1

and I think in a case like this it's important to preserve, that should the law change, that perhaps he would have some benefit there.

Also, in line with that is 218 USC 922(g), I'd say to, Your -- say that statute is void for vagueness, it's unconstitutional. There's issues with whether it's a crime of violence, and it's all over the place. Anytime -- every time the court comes down, even Sixth Circuit or Supreme Court, we get surprised by what is and what is not.

The question of what is on occasion separate than one another again is unclear, Justice Scalia was -- ranted pretty well in one of the most recent cases about how the court, the police officers and lawyers don't have much direction because it's such a vague statute. So I preserve that, also, for the record.

And, lastly, as I actually put it into other sentencing factors, more under 3553, but since that doesn't really get me anywhere, I would like to preserve the fact that Mr. Drew, he is a 67 IQ, and it has been found that those individuals have an intellectual disability and those that are intellectually disabled are treated differently. And I'm raising and Eighth Amendment objection for

```
1 the sentences both 18 U.S.C. 922(g) and 18 U.S.C.
```

- $2 \mid 924(c)$ as those sentences that result in the statute
- 3 | are excessive, cruel and unusual particularly
- 4 because we have an intellectual disability for
- 5 Mr. Drew, and that's -- and that's in the record and
- 6 in the Presentence Report.
- 7 THE COURT: Is that in your position
- 8 paper, too.

9

- MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: It is.
- 10 THE COURT: All right, thank you.
- 11 Let me hear now from Mr. Biggers.
- MR. BIGGERS: Your Honor, first,
- 13 addressing the objections filed by the defendant,
- 14 specifically to the findings that the robbery
- 15 convictions of the defendant are violent felonies
- 16 | for purposes, not only of the guideline
- 17 calculations, but also the Armed Career Criminal
- 18 Act.
- 19 The government responded to those
- 20 | objections in its position, and as the defense
- 21 counsel point out, recent case law from the Sixth
- 22 Circuit here in 2014 clearly establishes that
- 23 | Tennessee's robbery statute does constitute a
- 24 | violent felony for purposes of both the guideline
- 25 | calculations and the Armed Career Criminal Act.

2.1

In addition to that, the government will add that even if the court were not to consider the two sets of convictions in, I believe in paragraphs 43 and 48, the defendant still has three -- three other armed robbery convictions that would count and still qualify him as both an Armed Career Criminal and would subject him to that enhancement in the sentencing guideline.

Going to the second set of objections, the defense has brought -- raised today with regard to 922(g), the statute itself, those objections would not, I don't believe, were not raised in the defendant's position paper, but as the defense counsel pointed out the case law is well-established by both precedent and statute that 922(g)(1) and 922(g) as a whole in Title 18 is constitutional. And that the government is not obligated to set forth the prior convictions that would subject the defendant to the Armed Career Criminal Act and the indictment.

So based on that, Your Honor, the government submits that those objections, too, must be overruled.

The last -- defendant's last argument, which I think she stated today as an objection based

```
on his IQ, the government submits that has no
 1
 2
    bearing on the calculation itself. And not only
 3
    that, but for later argument the defendant is
 4
    competent. There is no question as to his
 5
    competency. There is no question as to his
    competency when he committed the offense for which
6
 7
    he is before the court today and ask that be
 8
    overruled as well.
9
              THE COURT: All right, thank you.
10
              Anything further?
11
              MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: All right, thank you.
13
              MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Other than I
14
    believe that Mr. Drew would like to allocute.
15
              THE COURT: We're -- I mean, he can now
16
    but normally when I go through the sentencing
17
    factors, that's when I hear from them.
18
              MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: That's fine, Your
19
    Honor, I couldn't remember.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think as both
2.1
    of you know, I'm going to have to overrule the
22
    objections that have been set out in the defense
23
    position paper. There's an objection to the use of
24
    and the way that the robbery convictions are used
```

with regard to Mr. Drew's criminal history, whether

25

2.1

or not they are violent offenses for purposes of the guidelines, and also for purposes of the statutes involved. Although the objections are made, defense counsel did make reference to and concede *United*States versus Mitchell 743 F.3rd 1054, it's a Sixth Circuit case that came out earlier this year, 2014, robbery is a violent offense as far as the State of Tennessee is concerned.

And so I understand the reason for lodging the objection. But the objection to use of those and the way that the convictions are used is going to have to be overruled.

The defense did include in the Presentence Report an objection because of his IQ. And those problems, as far as mental capacity are concerned, are included in the Presentence Report. I've read those and he was sent, and we will see starting at paragraph 69 of the Presentence Report, he was evaluated several times over the years, he was evaluated at Butner, North Carolina, the federal correctional institute there, and summary of the findings is included in the Presentence Report, which I have reviewed along with the entire report that was returned.

And there's just no issue with regard to

2.1

his competency. I understand about the -- the IQ and the finding that's set out in the position paper at 67, yet we see as part of the analysis that was made at Butner, because of their interactions with him, the more appropriate diagnosis for him, I see at page 19, is characterized by an IQ score within the range of 71 to 84. Now it's still not, you know, not huge, but it is somewhat of a difference from the six -- 67.

As far as that being a sentencing factor, we will take that into account later. But as far as the calculations are concerned, I don't think that's an issue. And for those purposes if an objection is made as far as the calculations are concerned with regard to his IQ, that will have to be overruled.

And so, as I said, in light of the state of the law as far as his prior convictions are concerned I will have to overrule the objections and the outline of the guidelines as well as statutory provisions with regard to sentencing.

Unless there are additional objections that I have to take up, those will become the findings of the court.

Anything further from the government?

MR. BIGGERS: Nothing further from the

government, Your Honor.

1 0

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. And then from the defense?

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand about the objections, they are lodged for the record, but I have to overrule the objections. And the calculations that I have outlined will become the findings of the court as well as the other facts and calculations involved in the Presentence Report.

We're going to go ahead and move to the next phase of sentencing. And that is the 3553 factors. I do have to review those and take them into account because of the attempt robbery convictions that we had, I have a statutory mandatory minimums as far as the firearms are concerned.

But I will hear from Ms. Robinson now -I'm sorry -- from Mr. Biggers now with regard to the sentencing factors.

MR. BIGGERS: Your Honor, I won't belabor the point as to sentencing, the court has already acknowledged that the statute pretty much rules in this particular case when it comes to sentencing.

As the government submitted in its

2.1

position paper an appropriate sentence in the particular case is a total sentence of 47 years on all counts.

The government submits that the mandatory

180 month sentence as required on the felon in

possession of a firearm count charged in Count Three
should be run concurrent with the two attempted
robbery counts charged in counts one and four.

And the two 924(c) counts which are required to run consecutive must all run consecutive.

But just -- the government would add that this particular case before the court dealing with the defendant Robert Drew is the reasons why congress implemented the Armed Career Criminal Act and career offender. The defendants like this, who have continued to engage in conduct, that not only endangers the lives of others, but also continues to put themselves at risk for monetary gain, that's the basis -- that's the reason that the need for the Armed Career Criminal Act as well as the career offender, and the 924(e), that this defendant, in looking at the facts of this particular case, had a gun, armed gun, loaded gun, put it in the face of two innocent victims, two young innocent victims

2.1

only working to make money, one, Mr. Baker working at a KFC restaurant here in Memphis, and the other, Mr. Harris, working at a Hickory Center Market right at the outskirts of Oakland, Tennessee, and ordered them to give him money.

He was wearing the same clothing, there is no question the jury already found that the defendant committed these acts, but he committed both of these acts and on the same night.

That in and of itself is very serious conduct, very serious conduct that put two different individuals' lives at stake in addiction to the defendant.

Look to the criminal history, or the history and the nature of the defendant himself, looking at his criminal history the court would point out defendant had multiple robbery convictions, not just simple robbery the defense pointed out in paragraphs 43 and 48, he had several other armed robbery convictions.

As the court already noted, even based on the armed robbery convictions, he would still be an armed career criminal, the armed career -- the armed robberies in 41, 42 and 44 are the paragraphs in the Presentence Report. He has a history of robbing

people with firearms.

2.1

He was arrested originally in 1981 for a series of robberies, for four separate robberies that occurred between June and July of 1981. Of the four robberies, three of those were armed robberies.

After being taken in custody for that and being sentenced to a significant sentence, he was released on parole in 1986, August of 1986. Within four years he would be -- picked up a new series of robberies, at least eight separate robberies. That was in January of 1990. He was taken back into custody at that point.

He escaped from custody in June of 1995. Within days, I believe a week he was taken back into custody on that. He was released in April of 2011 and within a year, December of the following year he picked up these two crimes for which he is before the court today.

Looking at that criminal history, clearly details how the importance of the 3553(a) factors, specifically the serious nature of the offense, the nature and history of the defendant, the need to promote respect for the law and afford adequate deterrence.

And, lastly, but most importantly in this

particular case, the need to protect the public from the defendant. There's clearly a need to protect the public from the defendant. And the government asks that you impose a sentence of 47 years as is required by statute and supported by the record.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Biggers.

Ms. Robinson.

2.1

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Well, Your Honor, the court can't really vary from the statute that controls this, but for the record, no one was injured in these robberies. The court can take that into consideration. No money was gotten, the court can take that into consideration.

Mr. Drew obviously has some intellectual deficits. The case that I cited for the court, the Hall versus Florida case.

One other thing that the court mentioned is that, unlike in *Atkins*, the state of Florida was using a bright line marker about what an intellectual disability of 70.

And what -- what *Hall* really did bring out is that there's a standard deviation, five points one way or the other. And even if 71 is correct, they could deviate downward five points.

So I think that from his record, from

2.1

what's shown in the Presentence Report that he does suffer from intellectual disability, and that's something else the court can consider.

This is a life sentence, did congress intend for this to be a life sentence, I don't think so, but that is something that the court can take into consideration.

And with reference to -- of course,

Mr. Drew maintains his innocence, as he did at the

trial of this matter, but it seems very clear to me

that there likely was another party involved. It

doesn't come out in the proof, but we did know that

there was some distance to be traveled between the

two establishments. And there was never any proof

about how that distance was traveled. And I just -
I suspect there may have been some pressure put on

the individual that committed these robberies and he

was out in the cold one way or the other.

But, again, Mr. Drew maintains his innocence, there's some unanswered questions. And I think the court can consider that in determining the sentence.

Again, our hands, mine, yours, are pretty tied by what the statutes are. So I will just leave it at that, Your Honor.

2.1

THE COURT: I guess the only flexibility that I have is the actual sentence to impose for the attempt robberies.

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: That's -- that's
right, Your Honor.

I'd ask the court, seems like 47 is -well, he's going to die in jail, I mean, that's what
is going to happen unless he's got some kind of
super powers that I'm not aware of. And I think
that's far too much to happen to him for these
botched robberies, for lack of a better word.

Again, not taking anything from the victims, they were frightened, but no money was taken, no one was hurt, and life sentences were meant, I think, for individuals who cause more harm than this.

And it appears that the individual who did commit this was intoxicated, impaired. It doesn't excuse the crime, but it does say that perhaps these are not as serious as other robberies.

I will leave it at that.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Mr. Drew, you do have the right to make a statement, we call it allocute. But at this time your lawyer has indicated that you do --

1 MR. ROBERT DREW: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: -- want to make a statement to 3 the court. If you want to make it, you don't have 4 to if you don't want to --5 MR. ROBERT DREW: I want to, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: -- but if you want to make a 7 statement, I will need to place you under oath. 8 MR. ROBERT DREW: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: So why don't you all come 10 forward at this -- this time to -- to the -- the 11 podium, and I will hear from you at this time, 12 Mr. Drew. 13 Okay. Why don't you raise your right 14 hand. 15 MR. ROBERT DREW: Uh-huh, sure. 16 THE COURT: Do you solemnly swear or 17 affirm, under the penalties of perjury, the 18 testimony that you are about to provide the court in 19 this matter will be the truth, the whole truth and 20 nothing but the truth, so help you God? 2.1 MR. ROBERT DREW: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: All right. You can put your 23 hand down. 24 Go ahead.

MR. ROBERT DREW: Your Honor, I'm here

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

today to -- to put this on the record that I left out during my trial that I wanted to, but my past history wouldn't allow me to due to the fact that so many thing's I wanted to say, but today is where I want to make clear to you, Your Honor, that my past history, my bank robberies and robberies that I done in the eighties, Your Honor, everything that I've done wrong, that I plead quilty to, these two counts of robbery that was put on me because of my past record, I -- I disagree with everything because my thought I already had proved that I wasn't the robbery when the polices took me to the place, the scene where the crime at, where you had said something in court, you said that me and my attorney was making a big complaint about me standing in -beside the police car at the scene of the crime where the crime had happened at.

Your Honor, at that night they took me to the scene of the crime and they zipped up my coat and everything to make me look more like the person what we see here because of the fact where the clothes that I had on, I didn't have no mud on me, nowhere. My facts is to proof that I didn't have no mud on me.

You look at the video, that coat that --

1 | that what they got, that coat don't have mud on it.

2 The coat that they given me trying to make me look

3 | like the person, there's mud on that coat.

2.1

Your Honor, I go on to say this here, I get back to the words of the profession coming from you that you said that you didn't see where that made a big difference by me standing in between those two police with handcuffs on.

Your Honor, the fact that that violated Miranda right to due process because the fact is I asked them for my attorney to be present with me because they had already laughed at me for my past record. Said, well, you -- you had a gun and you robbed a bank. I said, I never had a gun.

So I knew it wasn't the time for me to try to argue with the polices out there on the -- on the road where a crime had been committed.

 $\hbox{ so I asked for an attorney and they denied} \\ \hbox{ me. So I moved on from there $--$ I moved on from } \\ \hbox{ there.}$

But, Your Honor, as far as what I want to put on the record is that all through the investigation there's never were they brought up anything about the white car until April the 24th.

And I made it so clear to my attorney, I

2.1

made it so clear to the U. S. Marshal that said that he had been on the force for 19 years, I made it so clear to him at that point that when he came out to Somerville and picked me up, I told him the same identical thing I told the police, he said, well, what are you -- because I had guys in -- I -- I wear glasses for reading, but my vision is a little bit off at night, true enough, but the car that I walked up on I took it for a beige car.

And I, and through the investigation, I won't say nothing here today that's not on record, and we -- we talked about that with the detective, I told my attorney about the car. The car -- they stopped on the side of the road and said this that is Drew Hindu, I told you what he said, he said that's Drew Hindu.

Somebody called me, and I had been drinking, true, I had been drinking. As I get to walk to their car to see the faces of them who said that's that Drew Hindu, that gun car, so I ran back off the car. I don't want to get no closer to the car, I ran back from the car, the car that I said was a beige car.

I couldn't tell them what the license number, I couldn't tell them, I know there was three

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

guys in there, I know that much, I got that close enough before the gun car told me for me to get away from the car, I got that close.

But I said all of that to say, Your Honor, that that was hidden from the court. My attorney asked that U. S. Marshal here that I -- did he tell you -- did you do an investigation on him for what he told you that what had happened. And he said no.

Your Honor, that -- for them to put a car in with me, I thought it was supposed to be affront to the court that what we're telling with is the car, because the facts were, if the polices, if there's a car there at the time that I was there, what was the reason where the police didn't take the car under investigation. Because I already had made my statement. We standed beside the road for 35 or 40 minutes alone in the police car. For what reason I don't know. Then we went on around to the scene where the crime at. And Jesse Dodson came out, not Jesse Dodson -- suggested -- the guy work at the place, he came out the store, reviewed me and then he went back in, he went back in and I'm standing between the two police cars in handcuffs. And he said that the guy, the coat was like mine.

So far he went on to Somerville, Tennessee

2.1

and said that he don't -- he never said that it was me but he said it was a coat like mine. He said it again, and the record would show no different that what I'm, standing here today saying, and he said it was a coat like mine.

But when we come here on April the 24th, he said -- would you let the record show he got up and in court identification saying he identified me as the victim of the offense. A person who never came in contact with him period. Never came in contact.

And, Your Honor, just not to hold you up too long today, I just want to put this on the record, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROBERT DREW: -- that the more face from the computer was did the 24th here to take a mask, take -- take -- take a mask off the individual that on the video and mold my face, Your Honor, let the record show that that mold face don't look like my face what you are looking at today. If you look back through the record and see, that's not my face.

And that's a clear that -- so clear that -- that the right hand of the -- in the video, there's no glove. Anybody can see there's no glove

on that hand.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

If the person what had their hand, I thought that is what would have proved my innocence. A person who have a hand on the gun, I thought would leave some type of fingerprint on it. But he said he done so much of a good job for being for 14 years, but he didn't clear himself with fingerprints. And I was down there watching him fingerprint. We went outside and we smoked cigarettes and everything. And he thought that I may could be able to help him in the situation. I couldn't help him in the situation because he wouldn't come clean. He talked about it on the radio, and -- and the record will show that he said that go by my sister's house at 4782, her address, and check and see whether there was a white car there, and if there was a white car there, make no mind and give him a call. I told my attorney about that earlier in this here.

But by doing and reading the bible and understand, my authorities to rule over me, I'm going to obey them. There's nothing that I can do but put the courts upfront that it happened to me, put this on the record and let it be known, it -- it was so good thing that, because that I was an

ex-convict that showed prejudice against me, not treat me as the same you would treat anybody else, to show equal protection of the law, it's proof of the fact that's the way they done me.

My parole officer told me, said the facts in here that you being up under arrest, says with no reason them lights wasn't running, when the lights was running on the police car that my understanding was telling me they had been filming whatever is going on. I don't know that much about this, the police, the security, but that's what she said, when the lights is on, the camera is on, it's taking everything. But the camera didn't take up those guys stood behind that police car for 30 minutes before they took me to the scene of the crime.

The gun never came from up -- the record would show, if the light would show, the record would show they never got a gun off Robert Drew because Robert Drew never had a gun.

And -- and also the record would show that in my eighties time of robberies, Robert Drew never was carrying a gun. Robert Drew along with the people with guns, which I was just as much in the wrong as they were.

Also, the record would show that at the

time that the crimes and the murders were taking place, Robert Drew wasn't with the guy. Robert Drew was the one who turned the guys in.

I mean, I'm not trying to make myself a good guy, because I have committed a crime, but when I went and done my time for these bank robberies, I'm not supposed to have do time all over again because they said that, well, he's capable of doing anything, he could have done it.

Your Honor, I stand here today, I don't have a health problem, but there's no reason that anybody could see that I would be able to run from 16 miles in 40 minutes, it would have took me an hour, almost an hour to walk from that place to my house, there's no way that -- I couldn't -- it was impossible.

And the car is brought about the fall for insufficient evidence, I'm through with this for the day, Your Honor, I don't have anything to say.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Drew.

THE MARSHAL: Stay up here.

THE COURT: Now you can stay right there.

If you all prefer to go back to counsel table, that's fine, we will get finished.

MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: That's fine.

2.1

Is there a Kleenex, Your Honor? 1 2 THE COURT: Anything further, 3 Ms. Robinson? 4 MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Biggers? 6 MR. BIGGERS: Your Honor, briefly. 7 I'm not going to comment on the 8 defendant's statements other than I believe he misstated a lot of facts that occurred throughout 9 10 the trial. 11 THE COURT: I'm familiar with the trial. 12 MR. BIGGERS: I just say that for the 13 record, he misstated a lot of facts, Mr. Harris 14 never identified him in the courtroom, that is just 15 inaccurate. 16 But going to Ms. Robinson's argument 17 before about congress not intending this to be a 18 life sentence. 19 But for the defendant's extensive criminal 20 history of robberies, this would not be a life 2.1 sentence. He picked up his first robbery when he 22 was 24 years old. It's only the fact that he 23 continued until the age of 25 -- of 55 committing robberies that the sentence of 47 years is 24

ultimately a life sentence in this particular case.

25

2.1

And, furthermore, just add, that that sentence of 47 years, of 564 months is below the guideline ranged recommended in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Now is the time for me to go ahead and make the independent determination about the guidelines involved, impose a sentence with regard to guideline calculations as well as the statutory terms that are involved in this case.

As with any other case, I'm required to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish the purpose of the guidelines, the statutes as well as 3553. And so I am taking into account everything in making — making the final decision, the information contained in the Presentence Report, the evidence that was presented during the trial as well as the exhibits, the videos that were included in the trial, arguments of counsel, statements of Mr. Drew today, and as always, and in this case the entire record that is before me.

First, I have to take into account and -- and consider the nature and circumstances of the offenses involved.

The two offenses, I have to say are in all

2.1

of the counts, they are serious offenses. And I don't make that finding lightly. During the trial there were videos, what happened in the -- in the places, and the testimony from the victims involved about what they did when the robber came in, pointed the weapon at them, and their efforts to try to getaway, ultimately not being able to give the money to the individual and the individual left.

And so I don't say it lightly when I say that these are very serious, most serious crimes.

And the ultimate sentence has to be, has to take that into account.

I also have to recognize and consider the history and specific characteristics of the defendant involved in this case. Both sides have made reference to Mr. Drew's criminal history. He has made reference to it today in his statement, admitted that he has done some wrong things, some bad things, committed some acts in the past doesn't really understand why that has to, you know, be taken into account and punished all over again for that. So he's not really being punished all over for that.

Yet and still, he has a long criminal history. He really hasn't been on the streets that

2.1

long because he continues to commit violent offenses while he is out. And then is re-incarcerated for significant periods of time.

Make reference to paragraph 41, 42, 43, 44, those are the primary ones in the Presentence Report as set out a huge number of robberies that he was convicted of over the years.

But I also have to take into account what's happened, the sentences that he got. The fact that he was released on parole. I just pick one of them. Paragraph 41, robbery conviction, 15 years sentence, that was in '82, released in '86, parole was revoked in 1990, and then he was re-incarcerated.

He escaped from custody in 1995. Returned to custody after about a week or so. Released on parole in 2011. That parole was revoked in 2013. And expiration of that sentence actually in June of this year.

But that, I mean, the other paragraphs that I talked about are very similar. And it just demonstrates the difficulty in dealing with Mr. Drew that even being released into the community after serving portions of the sentence, how he has acted.

And so his criminal history, there are

that I have to take into account.

1 0

2.1

counts, and it is being taken into account, but even beyond the convictions, what he has done when released into the community is a significant factor

There is other information about Mr. Drew, his -- his personal background and history is included. I made reference before about his mental condition and the fact that he was evaluated at Butner. The results are included, and I have reviewed all of that information.

But as he said, as far as his physical condition is concerned, there are no issues in that regard.

He was born in Oakland, Tennessee back in the fifties, 1957.

And violence, as demonstrated in paragraph 60, was used by him, involved in his life at an early age.

His family, he has four siblings. And what has happened with them over the years is included in the Presentence Report.

But he has indicated that he has never really had a family. At an early age he began working in the cotton fields. He worked more than attended school, and he did attend church when he

|

was a child.

2.1

So I take those type things into account in making the final decision.

He was married at one point with a Ms. Quarrels, but they divorced a few years after being married. They have one child as a result of -- well, he has one child with a relationship with a different women.

And at the time, prior to his incarceration, he resided with a friend, a Tosha Jones on Highway 64, Oakland, Tennessee.

The probation office spoke with him -spoke with Ms. Jones, and the information there is
that the defendant is a hard worker, very nice and
sweat person, but then sometimes something comes
over him. I think that's demonstrated accurately
through the information that's presented in the
Presentence Report and the information that I am
taking into account today.

As I said, no physical issues.

There are some mental issues, but they are not really defenses, but I do take that into account in making the final decision.

As far as substance abuse is concerned, there are issues with alcohol. Over the years he's

2.1

tried marijuana, powdered cocaine and even crack cocaine.

There has been some substance abuse treatment while incarcerated at a coupled of the locations and he is interested in receiving additional treatment.

As far as education is concerned, I think he went Fayette Ware High School for sometime, I think he completed the eighth grade, did not finish and hasn't gotten his GED.

And there's very little as far as employment history is concerned.

Over the years he has worked in construction and landscaping, but there's little employment history because he's been incarcerated for lengthy periods of time.

There is no way that he can pay any type of a fine.

And so now I'm to the point where I have to impose the sentence. I'm taking all of that into account in making the final decision as far as the sentence is concerned.

Count One -- well, the reasons for the sentence, and as the statute says, it has to reflect the seriousness of the offense. I think I've

2.1

indicated that the offenses involved are very serious offenses.

Must promote respect for the law. That's a significant factor that I have to take into account because there has just been constant and repeated acts of violence over the years.

It has to provide adequate punishment, that is also an issue.

Deterrence is an issue, again, because there is just repeated instances of violent offenses over the years.

 $\hbox{ The public has to be protected from } \\ \hbox{further crimes of Mr. Drew.}$

Understand he maintains his innocence, but all of that -- many of the things that he said today, many of the issues that he claims and protest today were presented to a jury and the jury returned a verdict -- verdicts of guilty on all the counts.

And so I, as far as protection of the public from further crimes of the defendant, that is a significant factor that I have to take into account given his criminal history.

And so as to Count One of the indictment as well as Count Four of the indictment, the attempt robberies, I will vary from the guidelines and fix

his punishment at a hundred and 80 months confinement, that's 15 years.

1.3

2.1

As far as the 922(g), that's Count Three, under the statute the minimum is 15 years or a hundred and 80 months, and that will be the sentence in that case. That sentence will be run concurrently with counts one and four for an effective sentence of 15 years.

As far as Count Three of the indictment, punishment will be fixed at seven years confinement or 84 months confinement with the Bureau of Prisons. That has to be swerved consecutively to counts one, three and four.

And, finally, in Count Five of the indictment, the statutory minimum for that offense is 25 years. And that will be the sentence in that case. And it has to be run consecutive to all the other offenses, counts one through four.

Making the effective sentence in this case 47 years confinement with the Bureau of Prisons.

That does accomplish all of the factors.

It is a sentence that is adequate given his background and the circumstances of the offense, it will bring about deterrence of Mr. Drew and others similarly situated. And it does protect the

1

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

public from further crimes of the defendant. 2 does take into account the seriousness of the 3 offenses. 4 So that is going to be the sentence. There will be no fine. 5 6 He does have to pay the one hundred dollar 7 special assessment for each count of conviction. 8 And as far as supervised release is 9 concerned, for counts one and four that's three 10 years of supervised release. 11 For counts two, three, and five, there 12 will be five years of supervised release. 13 Of course, all of the terms of supervised 14 release will run concurrently. 15 That's the decision of the court at this time. 16 17

Have I left out anything, probation?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As far as supervised release, I don't know that will ever come into play, but he is to cooperate with the collection of DNA, drug testing and treatment under the direction of probation. Mental health counseling under the direction of probation.

That's the tentative findings of the

1 court. 2 I need to ask if there are any other 3 objections to the findings of the court with regard to the sentence. 4 5 Mr. Biggers? 6 MR. BIGGERS: Your Honor, I don't have any 7 objections. I would like to just make sure I have, 8 you went over a lot of sentence, I want to make sure that I have each one of them associated with the 9 10 proper count. 11 So correct me if I'm wrong, so we are --12 for counts one, three and four 180 month concurrent 13 sentences with each other. 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. BIGGERS: That's for --16 THE COURT: On counts for the 922(g) and 17 the two attempts. 18 MR. BIGGERS: That's correct, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. BIGGERS: Count Two, a consecutive 2.1 sentence of 84 months. 22 THE COURT: Seven years, 84 months, yes, 23 consecutive to counts one, three and four. 24 MR. BIGGERS: And Count Five, con

secrletary to all the other counts.

25

```
1
               THE COURT: All the other counts, yes.
 2
               MR. BIGGERS: Twenty-five years, or three
 3
    months?
               THE COURT: That's right.
 4
 5
              MR. BIGGERS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 7
               MR. BIGGERS: No objection from the
 8
    government.
 9
               THE COURT: Ms. Robinson, any additional
10
    objections?
11
              MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.
12
    think I put my position that was, by going to trial,
13
    we preserved his right to litigate or appeal the
14
    denial of the motion to suppress that we filed
15
    earlier.
               THE COURT: I understand.
16
17
              MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: So that's --
18
    nothing further, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: Then that will become the
20
    findings of the court.
2.1
              Mr. Drew has the right to appeal the
22
    decisions, the pretrial decisions as well as the
23
    things that happened during trial and sentencing.
24
               Assuming he wants to appeal, he will need
25
    to file that notice within 14 days.
```

1		MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: Thank you	ı, Your
2	Honor.		
3		THE COURT: Anything further?	
4		MS. JERMANN-ROBINSON: No Your I	Honor.
5		THE COURT: All right, thank you	ı for
6	coming in	today, you all are excused.	
7		MR. BIGGERS: Thank you, Your Ho	onor.
8	(Adjournment at 11:05 a.m.)		
9			
L 0			
L1			
L 2			
L3			
L 4			
L 5			
L 6			
L 7			
L 8			
L 9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
2 4			
25			

CERTIFICATE

I, Lynn Dudley, do hereby certify that the foregoing 48 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability, a true and accurate transcript from my stenotype notes of the sentencing hearing in on July 24, 2014, in the matter of:

United States of America

VS.

ROBERT DREW

Dated this 2nd day of September 2014.

Lynn Dudley Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of Tennessee